

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present response is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-11 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 4, and 8 are independent.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,953,481 to Watanabe, et al. (hereinafter, merely “Watanabe”)

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

“wherein, when the application is executed as a function of a command issued by the imaging device, **only a command for a termination of the application is allowed and every other command is disabled...**” (emphasis added)

As understood by Applicants, Watanabe discloses a reproducing apparatus with editing capabilities.

Applicants submit that nothing has been found in Watanabe that would teach or suggest the above-identified features of claim 1. Specifically, Applicants submit that Watanabe fails to teach or suggest that when the application is executed as a function of a command issued

by the imaging device, **only a command for a termination of the application is allowed and every other command is disabled**, as recited in claim 1.

The Office Action cites figure 3, 6, which is a block diagram of the system of Watanabe. The Office Action also cites column 8, line 60 – column 9, line 12, which teaches that when a pause command is issued when the recording is paused, recording is resumed, and when a pause command is issued when the recording is engaged, recording is paused.

The Office Action further cites Watanabe, column 11, lines 27-34, which states:

While this embodiment is arranged, by way of example, to hold the remote-control codes of the pause instruction and the pause cancel instruction for use of them in editing, the editing work can be carried out more freely and in a more refined manner with remote-control codes of some other operation instructions such as fast feeding, rewinding, etc., also held and used in addition to the remote-control codes of the pause instruction and the pause cancel instruction.

30

35

Applicants submit that the above-identified disclosure teaches the use of not only pause and unpause functions while recording, but also the use of “fast feeding, rewinding, etc.” while recording.

The Office Action further cites column 12, lines 33-59, which teaches the processing means detects the state of the mechanical deck and a command for start, stop, change in direction, reproducing and muting commands. In the case of an editing mode, the processing means stores cut-in points and cut-out points programmed by the editing operating keys during a programming operation. When performing editing action, the processing means controls a reproducing action and generates commands according to data stored in the storing means. “More specifically, the processing means 115 performs control in such a way as to begin the reproducing action just before the cut-in point as programmed and to send out remote-control data for a start of recording to the remote-control LED 119 when the cut-in point is passed. Then,

reproduction is allowed to be carried on in a normal manner. Remote-control data for an end of recording is sent out again to the remote-control LED 119 when the cut-out point is passed. The editing action is thus carried out by repeating the above-mentioned control actions on a plurality of programmed data.”

Applicants submit that the cited disclosure of Watanabe teaches that editing commands are only available at certain points, specifically between the cut in and cut out points. However, such disclosure or any combination of disclosure in Watanabe fail to teach or suggest that when an application needed for a recording operation obtained by controlling the recording device is executed as a function of a command issued by the imaging device, **only a command for a termination of the application is allowed and every other command is disabled.**

Therefore, claim 1 is patentable. Claims 4 and 8 are also patentable for similar or somewhat similar reasons.

III. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

Similarly, because Applicants maintain that all claims are allowable for at least the reasons presented hereinabove, in the interests of brevity, this response does not comment on each and every comment made by the Examiner in the Office Action. This should not be taken

as acquiescence of the substance of those comments, and Applicants reserve the right to address such comments.


CONCLUSION

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited reference, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference providing the basis for a contrary view.

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By 
Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800